



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.             | CONFIRMATION NO.            |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10/674,734  | 09/30/2003  | Alan G. Smith        | TI-36353                        | 3980                        |
| 23494 7590 08/23/2007<br>TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED<br>P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999<br>DALLAS, TX 75265 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>PHAM, CHRYSTINE     |                             |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2192                | PAPER NUMBER                |
|   |             |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE<br>08/23/2007 | DELIVERY MODE<br>ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com  
uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

|                              |                                      |                                       |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/674,734 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>SMITH, ALAN G. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Chrystine Pham    | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2192               |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Paper filed on June 7, 2007. No amendments have been made. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 7, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant essentially contends, "[Peart] neither teaches nor does he suggest any combining of data type tables" (Remarks, page 7, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph). However, as has been established in the previous Office Action (page 3), col.6:42-60 of Peart explicitly discloses collecting application-related information from each of the application servers in a server farm. The same passage explicitly discloses the *application-related information* including the application name and **data types** supported by (i.e., **associated with**) the **application** as well as file types associated with the supported data types. In other words, the *application-related information* is a **mapping** that identifies the association (i.e., relationship) between a particular executable program for use with a particular data file (i.e., data type). The same passage further discloses storing the *application-related information* in a **database**. Col.13:52-col.14:50 similarly discloses each server maintaining its own application-related information (i.e., mappings), which can be communicated and made accessible to each other

server in the server farm. Col.22:28-43 of Peart further discloses said **mappings** are stored in a **relational database**. Needless to say, a **relational database** consists of **tables** storing rows of records and columns of data (e.g., application name, data types supported by the application) that are mapped to the same record (i.e., application). Thus, the mappings between each application and its associated data types that stored in tables of the relational database clearly anticipate data type tables. Furthermore, col.22:35-43 of Peart explicitly discloses updating the mappings on each of the server (i.e., each database) across the server farm based on the information that each server obtains from communications with each other server (col.14:45-50). Thus, contrary to Applicant's argument, Peart clearly teaches combining the data type tables.

In response to applicant's arguments against the reference Moore et al. individually (Remarks, page 7, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

3. In view of foregoing discussion, rejection of claims under 35 USC 103(a) is considered proper and maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peart (US 7117243 B2) in view of Moore et al. of record (US 5696975, "Moore").

**Claim 1**

Peart teaches a computer system having application programs stored on remote memory module (see at least *server node, application program, executable programs* col.20:4-27) comprising:

a computer system (see at least *client system* col.2:42-65) having a first data type table that stores application and file type associations (see at least *executable program, mapping, type of data file* col.2:42-64; *database, application-related information, file types associated with application, client node* col.6:42-60; col.20:46-60);

at least one remote memory module (see at least *servers* col.22:15-34) that can be connected to the computer system such that storage locations on the module become accessible to the computer system (see at least *mappings, executable programs, client node* col.22:15-34; *application programs, application servers, client node* col.7:14-56; col.14:32-42; col.14:57-65);

Art Unit: 2192

an application program stored on the remote memory module (see at least *application programs, application servers* col.7:14-56; *application database 48, server, application-related information* col.13:63-col.14:1);

a second data type table stored on the remote memory module (see at least col.6:42-60; *file-type association, storage device* col.20:46-60; col.22:55-64);

a system computer software routine to combine the first and second data type table to form a virtual extension table that is used to determine which application is to be used for a given file type (see at least *received mapping, executable program, type of data file* col.2:42-64; *Program Neighborhood application, application-related information, application servers, data types, file types* col.6:42-60; col.14:59-65; *TABLE 3, File type, Executable program* col.22:15-34).

Peart does not expressly disclose said remote memory/storage module as a “removable” memory/storage module.

However, Moore discloses a computer system having application programs stored on removable storage (see at least 124, 126 FIG.6A & associated text); at least one removable memory module that can be inserted into the computer system such that the storage locations on the module become assessable to the computer system (see at least 112, 116, 118, 122, 120 FIG.6A & associated text); an application program stored on the removable memory module (see at least 124, 126 FIG.6A & associated text).

Peart and Moore are analogous art because they are both directed to

Art Unit: 2192

execution/launching of applications. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Moore into that of Peart for the inclusion of a "removable" memory module. And the motivation for doing so would have been to provide associated applications (from external sources such as the server or the removable storage module) for distributed execution of certain file types residing on the computer system (see at least Peart col.2:31-40; Moore col.1:9-col.2:60).

#### Claim 2

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Peart further teaches wherein the application and file type associations are determined by a file name extension associated with a specific file type (see at least *filename extensions* col.20:46-60).

#### Claim 3

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Moore further teaches wherein the computer software routine determines the priority of associating an application and file type in the virtual table by giving first priority to any application installed after insertion of the removable memory module (see at least *mappings, updated, new application program* col.22:35-43; 162, 158 FIG.8B & associated text; 122 FIG.8A & associated text).

#### Claim 4

Art Unit: 2192

The rejection of base claim 3 is incorporated. Peart further teaches wherein the computer software routine determines the priority of associating an application and file type in the virtual table by giving second priority to any application installed on recently connected removable memory modules with the more recently installed module given higher priority over subsequently installed memory modules (see at least 162, 158 FIG.8B & associated text; 122 FIG.8A & associated text; *privilege* col.24:17-col.25:9).

#### Claim 5

Peart teaches a portable handheld computer (see at least *portable storage media, mappings, client node* col.23:13-39) comprising the elements recited in claim 1, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 1.

#### Claims 6-11

Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claims 1-4, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claims 1-4.

### **Conclusion**

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory




action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chrystine Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-3702. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2192

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER